

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 and 27-32 are pending, with claims 24-26 cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present Amendment. Claims 1, 15 and 19 are independent.

In the Official Action, claims 24-26 were objected to; claims 27-29 were objected to; claims 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gounares (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0215142); and claims 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gounares and Geidl (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0053084).

Applicants traverse the objection and rejection of claims 27-29. Paragraph [0056] discloses “In other examples of the invention, however, as illustrated in FIGS. 7A and 7B, the original ink word *arrangement and spacing is maintained* in the machine-generated text. This arrangement is particularly advantageous, for example, in instances when the *orientation or arrangement of text also conveys information to the reader*, for example, if the text contains lists, *rows, columns*, charts, mathematics, formulae, etc.” A table consists of rows and columns. Accordingly, the “table” and “table column-spacing” if claims 27-29 are supported by the originally filed specification.

Briefly recapitulating, claim 1 is directed to

A method, comprising:

receiving electronic ink input;

converting the electronic ink input to one or more machine-generated objects; and

rendering the one or more machine-generated objects such that a size and an inter-word spacing of the rendered machine-generated object or objects substantially corresponds to an original size and an original inter-word spacing of the electronic ink input.

Independent claims 15 and 19 are directed to a system and computer program product for performing the method of claim 1.

Gounares describes a method of converting cursive electronic pen inputs into printed text. However, contrary to the Official Action, Gounares does not disclose or suggest rendering the one or more machine-generated objects such that *a size* and *an inter-word spacing* of the rendered machine-generated object or objects substantially corresponds to *an original size* and *an original inter-word spacing* of the electronic ink input.

As seen by comparing Figs. 3 and 5 of Gounares, the *size* and *inter-word spacing* of the printed text (i.e., the rendered machine-generated object(s)) is much smaller than the *size* and *inter-word spacing* of the cursive text (i.e., the electronic ink input). Geidl does not cure the deficiencies of Gounares.

As none of the cited art, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the above-noted features of claims 1, 15 and 19, Applicants submit the inventions defined by claims 1, 15 and 19, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.<sup>1</sup>

Turning to claim 6, contrary to the Official Action, Gounares does not disclose or suggest “the one or more rendered machine-generated objects are *arranged so as to correspond to an original arrangement* of the electronic ink input.” As seen by comparing Figs. 3 and 5 of

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP § 2142 “...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Gournares, the words “new” and “dedicated” are on different lines. This is more apparent by comparing Figs. 3 and 6, where print words of Fig. 6 are on different lines than the cursive words of Fig. 3. Geidl does not cure the deficiencies of Gournares. Thus, for independent reasons, Applicant submits that claim 6 patentably defines over the applied references.

Turning to claims 21-23, contrary to the Official Action, Gournares does not disclose or suggest “rendering the one or more machine-generated objects such that a *word positioning* of the rendered machine-generated object or objects substantially *corresponds to an original word positioning* of the electronic ink input.” As seen by comparing Figs. 3 and 5 of Gournares, the words “new” and “dedicated” are on different lines. This is more apparent by comparing Figs. 3 and 6, where print words of Fig. 6 are on different lines than the cursive words of Fig. 3. Geidl does not cure the deficiencies of Gournares. The applied references also do not disclose or suggest the features of claims 27-29. Thus, for independent reasons, Applicants submit that claims 21-23 and 27-29 patentably define over the applied references.

In view of the above Amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael E. Monaco (Reg. No. 52,041) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant